

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PORTLAND DIVISION

McKENZIE LAW FIRM, P.A., and OLIVER
LAW OFFICES, INC. on Behalf of
Themselves and All Others Similarly
Situating,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RUBY RECEPTIONISTS, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:18-CV-01921-SI

**DECLARATION OF LAURENCE D. KING IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES FILED ON BEHALF
OF KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP**

I, Laurence D. King, declare as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm of Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP ("Kaplan Fox").

I submit this declaration in support of Class Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees in connection with services rendered in this case, as well as the reimbursement of expenses incurred by my firm in connection with this class action litigation, including both this Federal Action and a parallel action in the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein based upon my active supervision and participation in all material aspects of the litigation.

2. My firm acted as counsel for plaintiffs and appointed as Class Counsel in this Federal action, as well as counsel for plaintiff in the parallel action pending in Circuit Court of

the State of Oregon, Multnomah County. My firm has extensive class action experience. The firm represents individuals, small businesses, institutional and individual investors/shareholders and employees in class action cases litigated in the United States. My firm has frequently served as sole lead-counsel, as co-lead counsel, or on an executive committee in numerous class actions, including cases such as this one brought on behalf of consumers for more than 50 years.

3. The work done in this case by Plaintiffs' Counsel is described in detail in the Joint Declaration in Support of the Motion for Final Approval and Award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Service Awards to Plaintiffs ("Joint Declaration"), which is being filed concurrently with this declaration.

4. The schedule attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a detailed summary indicating the amount of time, by category, spent by the partners, other attorneys, and professional support staff of my firm who were involved in this litigation, and the lodestar calculation based on my firm's current billing rates.¹ The schedule was prepared from contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by my firm, which are available at the request of the Court for review *in camera*.² Time expended in preparing this application for fees and reimbursement of expenses has not been included in this request.

5. The hourly rates for the partners, other attorneys, and professional support staff in my firm included in Exhibit 1 are the same as the regular current rates charged for their services in non-contingent matters and/or which have been used in the lodestar cross check accepted by courts in other class litigation.

¹ This application does not include time for anyone who spent fewer than 5 hours on this litigation.

² These records may include information concerning privileged and/or confidential attorney-client communications or work product.

6. As of April 30, 2021 the total number of hours expended on this litigation by my firm is 1857.8 hours. The total lodestar based on the law firm's current rates is \$1,290,940.50.

7. My firm's work on this matter touched upon all aspects of this litigation from its inception in July 2017 and is described in detail in the Joint Declaration which is being filed concurrently with this Declaration.

8. My firm's lodestar figures are based upon the firm's billing rates, which rates do not include charges for expense items. Expense items are billed separately, and such charges are not duplicated in my firm's billing rates.

9. I have general familiarity with the range of hourly rates typically charged by plaintiffs' class action counsel in the district where my firm is located and throughout the United States, both on a current basis and historically. From that basis I am able to conclude that the rates charged by my firm are commensurate with those prevailing in the market for such legal services furnished in complex class action litigation, such as this. The hourly rates of Kaplan Fox are reasonable is bolstered by the following authorities and evidence:

- (a) These rates are those normally offered and charged to clients for non-contingent work and have not been altered to account for the contingent nature of this litigation or the delay in payment.
- (b) These rates have been deemed reasonable in connection with the approval of my firm's fee applications in recent matters.
- (c) The hourly rates are commensurate with what other lawyers of similar experience charge, as acknowledged by courts in the 9th Circuit and elsewhere.

10. As detailed in Exhibit 2, my firm has incurred a total of \$204,130.18 in unreimbursed expenses in connection with the prosecution of this litigation.

11. The expenses incurred in this action are reflected on the books and records of my firm, which are available at the request of the Court. These books and records are prepared from

expense vouchers, check records and other source materials and are an accurate record of the expenses as charged by the vendors. Third-party expenses are not marked up. Upon request, we will provide the Court with copies of documentation for each of the costs itemized above.

12. By agreement between Plaintiffs' Counsel, my firm is not charging separately for the following costs and expenses: secretarial and clerical overtime, including their meals and local transportation; after-hours HVAC; word processing; secretarial/clerical time for document preparation; time charges for routine copying, faxing or scanning; incoming/outgoing fax charges; office supplies (such as paper, binders, etc.); special publications; continuing legal education seminars; working meals for attorneys (with the exception of meals with clients, expert or other witnesses, or meal expenses for meetings between Plaintiffs' Counsel); and local overtime meals and transportation for attorneys.

13. With respect to the standing of counsel in this case, attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is my firm's résumé and brief biographies for the attorneys in my firm who were principally involved in this litigation.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this 10th day of May, 2021.



Laurence D. King

EXHIBIT 1***MCKENZIE LAW FIRM, P.A. v. RUBY RECEPTIONISTS, INC******MAIDEN v. RUBY RECEPTIONISTS, INC.*****Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP****TIME REPORT — Inception through April 30, 2021**

Name	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Total Hours	Hourly Rate	Total Lodestar
PARTNERS:											
Laurence D. King	18.2	53.1	12.6	46.7	109.0	56.7	53.1	132.8	482.2	940.00	\$453,268.00
ATTORNEYS:											
Mario M. Choi	4.1	234.8	327.2	32.2	72.0	22.7	39.8	11	743.8	725.00	\$539,255.00
Matthew George	1.5	33.0	103.9	18.4	1.8		8.4	2.4	169.4	775.00	\$131,285.00
Linda M. Fong	17.4		5.0				.5		22.9	635.00	\$14,885.00
Walter Howe		32.0	26.1						58.1	425.00	\$24,692.50
Deidre Roney			208.6						208.6	350.00	\$73,010.00
PARAPROFESSIONAL STAFF:											
Kevin Cosgrove			108.3				7.2		115.5	335.00	\$38,692.50
Mandrika Moonsammy			17.5						17.5	335.00	5,862.50
Susan Powley	.8	17.0	2.5		1.5	7.0	.5	.2	29.5	295.00	\$8,702.50
Nikki Lee		1.4	8.9						10.3	125.00	\$1,287.50
TOTAL LODESTAR											
	42.0	371.3	820.6	97.3	184.3	86.4	109.5	146.4	1857.8		\$1,290,940.50

CATEGORIES

- a. Case Assessment, Pre-Filing Investigation, Initial Complaint
- b. Briefs, Motions, Pleadings and Research
- c. Discovery and Post-Filing Investigation
- d. Class Certification, Notice Issues, Decertification
- e. Experts & Consultants
- f. Court Appearances & Preparation
- g. Conferences, Interviews, Telephone Calls, Meetings & Correspondence
- h. Mediation & Settlement

Exhibit 1

Exhibit 3

Joint Declaration in Support of Motion for Final Approval and Award of Attorney Fees and Costs and Service Awards to Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT 2***MCKENZIE LAW FIRM, P.A. v. RUBY RECEPTIONISTS, INC******MAIDEN v. RUBY RECEPTIONISTS, INC.*****Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP****EXPENSE REPORT — Inception through April 30, 2021**

<u>Categories:</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Photocopies/Reproduction	
Postage/Notice Costs	\$3,243.27
Telephone	
Messengers/Express Services	\$386.06
Filing/Witness Fees/ <i>Pro-Hac Vice</i> Fees	\$3,090.00
Court Reporters/Transcript/Video	\$6,768.15
Computer Research (Lexis, Pacer, etc.)	\$21,745.71
Experts/Consultants/Professional Services	\$158,183.25
Document and Data Management Expenses	
Mediation	
Out-of-Town Meals/Hotel/Transportation	\$10,713.74
TOTAL EXPENSES:	\$204,130.18

NEW YORK, NY

LOS ANGELES, CA

Exhibit 2

OAKLAND, CA

CHICAGO, IL

WASHINGTON, D.C.

MORRISTOWN, NJ

Exhibit 3

EXHIBIT 3

[FIRM RESUME AND ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHIES]



KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP

FIRM PROFILE

850 Third Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Tel.: 212.687.1980
Fax: 212.687.7714

681 Prestwick Lane
Wheeling, IL 60090
Tel.: 847.831.1585
Fax.: 847.831.1580

1999 Harrison Street,
Suite 1560
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel.: 415.772.4700
Fax: 415.772.4707

12400 Wilshire Boulevard,
Suite 820
Los Angeles, CA 90025
Tel.: 310.575.8604
Fax: 310.444.1913

6109 32nd Place, NW
Washington, DC 20015
Tel.: 202.669.0658

160 Morris Street
Morristown, NJ 07960
Tel.: 973.656.0222
Fax: 973.401.1114

Exhibit 3
Page 1 of 12

Exhibit 3

History of Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP

Leo Kaplan and James Kilsheimer founded “Kaplan & Kilsheimer” in 1954, making the firm one of the most established litigation practices in the country. James Kilsheimer was a celebrated federal prosecutor in the late 1940s and early 1950s in New York who not only successfully tried some of the highest profile cases in the country, but also handled the U.S. Attorney’s Office’s criminal appeals to the Second Circuit.

Now known as “Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP,” the early commitment to high-stakes litigation continues to define the firm to the present day. In 2009, Portfolio Media’s *Law360* ranked Kaplan Fox’s securities litigation practice as one of the top 5 in the country (plaintiff side), and again in July 2014, the Legal 500 ranked Kaplan Fox as one of the top eight plaintiff’s firms for securities litigation. In March 2013, the *National Law Journal* included Kaplan Fox on its list of the top 10 “hot” litigation boutiques, a list that includes both plaintiff and defense firms. In 2014, 2015 and 2016, more than half of the firm’s partners – including attorneys on both coasts – were rated “Super Lawyers.”

The firm has three primary litigation practice areas (antitrust, securities, and consumer protection), and the firm is a leader in all three. To date, we have recovered more than **\$5 billion** for our clients and classes. In addition, the firm has expanded its consumer protection practice to include data privacy litigation, and few other firms can match Kaplan Fox’s recent leadership in this rapidly emerging field. The following describes Kaplan Fox’s major practice areas, its most significant recoveries and its attorneys.

Securities Litigation

Over the past 35 years, Kaplan Fox has been a leader in prosecuting corporate and securities fraud —ranging from cases concerning accounting fraud to those involving complicated and complex financial instruments. Since the passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act in 1995, Kaplan Fox has emerged as one of the foremost securities litigation firms representing institutional investors of all sizes, including many of the world's largest public pension funds.

Kaplan Fox's selection by Portfolio Media's Law360 as one of the five top securities litigation firms (plaintiff side) for 2009 was based, in part, on the representation of public pension funds in high profile and complex securities class actions. Some of the firm's most significant securities recoveries include:

In re Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative, and ERISA Litigation, MDL No. 2058 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$2.425 billion recovered)

In re Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. Securities Litigation, Master File No. 07-CV-9633 (JSR) (S.D.N.Y.) (\$475 million recovered)

In re 3Com Securities Litigation, No. C-97-21083-EAI (N.D. Cal.) (\$259 million recovered)

In re Fannie Mae 2008 Securities Litigation, No. 08-cv-7831 (PAC) (S.D.N.Y.) (\$170 million recovered)

In re MicroStrategy Securities Litigation, No. CV-00-473-A (E.D. Va.) (\$155 million recovered)

AOL Time Warner Cases I & II (Opt-out), Nos. 4322 & 4325 (Cal. Superior Court, LA County) (\$140 million recovered)

In re Informix Securities Litigation, C-97-129-CRB (N.D. Cal.) (\$136.5 million recovered)

In re Xcel Energy, Inc. Securities Litigation, Master File No. 02-CV-2677-DSD (D. Minn.) (\$80 million recovered)

In re Elan Corporation Securities Litigation, No. 02-CV-0865-RMB (S.D.N.Y.) (\$75 million recovered)

In re Sequenom, Inc. Securities Litigation, No. 09-cv-921 (S.D. Cal.) (\$70 million recovered)

Barry Van Roden, et al. v. Genzyme Corp., et al., No. 03-CV-4014-LLS (S.D.N.Y.) (\$64 million recovered)

Antitrust Litigation

Kaplan Fox has been at the forefront of significant private antitrust actions, and we have been appointed by courts as lead counsel or members of an executive committee for plaintiffs in some of the largest antitrust cases throughout the United States. This commitment to leadership in the antitrust field goes back to at least 1967, when firm co-founder Leo Kaplan was appointed by the Southern District of New York to oversee the distribution of all ASCAP royalties under the 1950 antitrust consent decree in **United States v. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers**, No. 41-CV-1395 (S.D.N.Y.), a role he held for 28 years until his death in 1995. To this day, ASCAP awards the “Leo Kaplan Award” to an outstanding young composer in honor of Leo’s 28 years of service to ASCAP.

Members of the firm have also argued before the U.S. Courts of Appeals some of the most significant decisions in the antitrust field in recent years. For example, Robert Kaplan argued the appeal in **In re Flat Glass Antitrust Litigation**, 385 F.3d 350 (3d Cir. 2004), and Greg Arenson argued the appeal in **In re High Fructose Corn Syrup Antitrust Litigation**, 295 F.3d 651 (7th Cir. 2002). In a relatively recent survey of defense counsel, in-house attorneys, and individuals involved in the civil justice reform movement, both were named among the 75 best plaintiffs’ lawyers in the country based on their expertise and influence.

Over the years, Kaplan Fox has recovered over **\$2 billion** for our clients in antitrust cases. Some of the larger antitrust recoveries include:

In re Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation, MDL 1775 (E.D.N.Y.) (settled during trial preparation, for total settlement of more than \$1.25 billion)

In re Neurontin Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1479, Master File No. 02-1390 (D.N.J.) (\$190 million recovered)

In re High Fructose Corn Syrup Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1087, Master File No. 95-1477 (C.D. Ill.) (\$531 million recovered)

In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation, MDL 997 (N.D. Ill.) (\$720 plus million recovered)

In re Infant Formula Antitrust Litigation, MDL 878 (N.D. Fla.) (\$126 million recovered)

In re Flat Glass Antitrust Litigation, MDL 1200 (W.D. Pa.) (\$122 plus million recovered)

In re Hydrogen Peroxide Antitrust Litigation, MDL 1682 (E.D. Pa.) (\$97 million recovered)

In re Plastics Additives Antitrust Litigation, 03-CV-1898 (E.D. Pa.) (\$46.8 million recovered)

In re Medical X-Ray Film Antitrust Litigation, CV 93-5904 (E.D.N.Y.) (\$39.6 million recovered)

In re NBR Antitrust Litigation, MDL 1684 (E.D. Pa.) (\$34.3 million recovered)

Consumer Protection and Data Privacy Litigation

The consumer protection practice is headquartered in Kaplan Fox's Bay Area office, which opened in 2000, and is led by Laurence King, an experienced trial lawyer and former prosecutor.

Mr. King and our other effective and experienced consumer protection litigators regularly champion the interests of consumers under a variety of state and federal

consumer protection laws. Most frequently, these cases are brought as class actions, though under certain circumstances an individual action may be appropriate.

Kaplan Fox's consumer protection attorneys have represented victims of a broad array of misconduct in the manufacturing, testing, marketing, and sale of a variety of products and services and have regularly been appointed as lead or co-lead counsel or as a member of a committee of plaintiffs' counsel in consumer protection actions by courts throughout the nation. Among its significant achievements are highly recognized cases including **In re Baycol Products Litigation**, MDL 1431-MJD/JGL (D. Minn.) (victims have recovered \$350 million recovered); **In re: Apple Inc. Device Performance Litigation**, No. 5:18-md-02827-EJD (N.D. Cal.) (\$310 million settlement for diminished performance of iPhone 6s and iPhone 7s running certain Apple iOS software); **In re Providian Financial Corp. Credit Card Terms Litigation**, MDL No. 1301-WY (E.D. Pa.) (\$105 million recovered); **In re Thomas and Friends Wooden Railway Toys Litig.**, No. 07-cv-3514 (N.D. Ill.) (\$30 million settlement obtained for purchasers of recalled "Thomas Train" toys painted with lead paint); **In re Pre-Filled Propane Tank Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation**, No. 4:09-md-2086 (W.D. Mo.) (settlements obtained where consumers will receive substantially in excess of actual damages and significant injunctive relief); **Berry v. Mega Brands Inc.**, No. 08-CV-1750 (D.N.J.) (class-wide settlement obtained where consumers will receive full refunds for defective products), and **David Wolf, et al. v. Red Bull GmbH, et al.**, No. 1:13-cv-08008 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$13 million settlement fund obtained for purchasers of Red Bull energy drink).

Data privacy is a fairly new area of law and broadly encompasses two scenarios. In a data breach case, a defendant has lawful custody of data, but fails to safeguard it or use it in an appropriate manner. In a tracking case, the defendant intercepts or otherwise gathers digital data to which it is not entitled in the first place.

Kaplan Fox is an emerging leader in both types of data privacy litigation. For example, Mr. King filed and successfully prosecuted one of very first online data breach cases, **Syran v. LexisNexis Group**, No. 05-cv-0909 (S.D. Cal.), and was court-appointed liaison counsel in a recently successfully concluded data breach case against LinkedIn. See **In re: LinkedIn User Privacy Litigation**, No. 12-cv-3088-EJD (N.D. Cal.). The firm also settled a data privacy case against Universal Property & Casualty Insurance Company related to the public exposure of sensitive customer data. See **Rodriguez v. Universal Property & Cas. Ins. Co.**, No. 16-cv-60442-JK (S.D. Fla.).

The firm is also an industry leader in the even newer field of email and internet tracking litigation. Kaplan Fox was appointed Co-Lead Class Counsel in a digital privacy class action against Yahoo!, Inc., related to Yahoo's alleged practice of scanning emails for content, which was recently settled. See **In re: Yahoo Mail Litigation**, 5:13-cv-04980-LHK (N.D. Cal.). Current cases include **In re: Facebook Internet Tracking Litigation**, No. 5:12-md-02314-EJD (N.D. Cal.) (Davila, J.), and **In re: Google Inc. Cookie Placement Consumer Privacy Litig.**, 12-MD-2358-SLR (D. Del.) (Kaplan Fox appointed to plaintiffs' steering committee).

ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHIES

PARTNER

LAURENCE KING first joined Kaplan Fox as an associate in 1994. He became a partner of the firm in 1998. While Mr. King initially joined the firm in New York, in 2000 he relocated to San Francisco to open the firm's first West Coast office. He is now partner-in-charge of the firm's Oakland and Los Angeles offices. In that capacity, he has regularly served as a lead member of the litigation team for Kaplan Fox's California-based institutional investor clients, and is always available at a moment's notice.

Mr. King practices primarily in the areas of securities litigation, with an emphasis on institutional investor representation and consumer protection litigation. He has also

practiced in the area of employment litigation. Mr. King has played a substantial role in cases that have resulted in some of the largest recoveries ever obtained by Kaplan Fox, including *In re Bank of America Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.), *In re 3Com Securities Litigation* (N.D. Ca.), *In re Informix Securities Litigation* (N.D. Ca.), *AOL Time Warner Cases I & II* (Ca. Sup. Ct., L.A. Cty.) and *Providian Credit Card Cases* (Ca. Sup. Ct., S.F. Cty.).

An experienced trial lawyer, prior to joining Kaplan Fox Mr. King served as an assistant district attorney under the legendary Robert Morgenthau in the Manhattan (New York County) District Attorney's Office, where he tried numerous felony prosecutions to jury verdict. At Kaplan Fox, he was a member of the trial team for two securities class actions tried to verdict, *In re Biogen Securities Litigation* (D. Mass.) and *In re Health Management Securities Litigation* (E.D.N.Y.). Mr. King also prepared for numerous cases for trial in which favorable settlements were ultimately achieved.

Mr. King has been selected for inclusion in the Northern California *SuperLawyers* each year since 2012, and has previously served as Vice-Chair, and then as Co-Chair, of the American Association for Justice's Class Action Litigation Group of the American Association for Justice.

Education:

- B.S., Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania (1985)
- J.D., Fordham University School of Law (1988)

Bar Affiliations and Court Admissions:

- Bar of the State of New York (1989)
- Bar of the State of California (2000)
- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fifth, Ninth and Tenth Circuits
- U.S. District Courts for the District of New Jersey, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, and Northern, Central and Southern Districts of California

Professional Affiliations:

- Bar Association of San Francisco
- American Bar Association
- American Association for Justice

- San Francisco Trial Lawyers' Association
- American Business Trial Lawyers

Mr. King can be reached by email at: LKing@kaplanfox.com

OF COUNSEL

MATTHEW GEORGE is a complex litigation attorney at Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP with a practice focused on data privacy, consumer protection, and employment/labor cases. He has significant experience and expertise handling multidistrict litigation and other coordinated proceedings in state and federal courts involving multiple parties and complex discovery issues.

Matthew has been a strong advocate for consumer and patient privacy. He has served on court-appointed lead counsel teams in notable cutting-edge data breach and information privacy cases against Target, Adobe, Yahoo!, and Horizon Healthcare. In these and other cases he has worked with cybersecurity experts to gain technical knowledge in data collection, management and protection. He was recently appointed to the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re 21st Century Oncology Data Breach Litigation*, MDL No. 2737, pending in the Middle District of Florida.

Matthew has also recovered unpaid overtime wages for thousands of workers across the United States under state and federal law in over a dozen cases. His notable recoveries include generating a \$9.9 million settlement on behalf of retail employees and winning a two-week arbitration representing misclassified account representatives against a Fortune 500 company. Matthew has also recovered over \$10 million for employees in cases alleging violations of the WARN Act when the employees were not provided required notice before their terminations.

He has also represented customers challenging deceptive business practices and has worked to obtain significant recoveries in consumer fraud cases against companies including Chase, Mercedes-Benz and The Ritz-Carlton. He currently represents consumers in cases against HBO, Logitech, and Chipotle, among others. In addition to representing plaintiffs in class action cases, Matthew has also represented institutional clients including labor unions and conducted a risk management analysis for a multi-national health and wellness consumer product corporation.

Matthew has been selected by his peers as a “Rising Star” by Northern California Super Lawyers each year from 2011-2014 and was chosen as a “Super Lawyer” in 2016, the first year he was eligible for the distinction. He has been a regular speaker at industry conventions and seminars on topics ranging from arbitration, expert discovery, settlement strategies, and the rapidly changing field of privacy law.

Education:

- B.A., Political Science and Criminal Justice, *magna cum laude*, Chapman University (2002)
- J.D., The University of Michigan Law School (2005)

Publications and Speaking Engagements:

- Expert Depositions: Promoting Expertise and Limiting Exposure –Bridgeport Continuing Legal Education “Mastering the Deposition” Seminar (January 2017)
- “How Viable Is the Prospect of Private Enforcement of Privacy Rights In The Age of Big Data? An Overview of Trends and developments In Privacy Class Actions” – Competition, The Journal of the Antitrust and Unfair Competition Law Section of the State Bar of California, Volume 24, No. 1 (Spring 2015)
- Panel Discussion of Sony Pictures Data Breach Cases – CNBC’s “Squawk On the Street” (December 2014)
- New and Developing Practice Areas – CAOC 53rd Annual Convention (November 2014)
- Privacy Law Symposium – University of California, Hastings College of the La (April 2014)
- Update On the Target Data Breach Litigation – HarrisMartin Target Data Breach MDL Conference (March 2014)
- Consumer Privacy Law – 8th Annual CAOC Class Action Seminar (February 2014)
- Privacy Litigation and Management: Strategies For Protection and Litigation – Bridgeport Continuing Legal Education Seminar (December 2012)
- Class Action Settlement Strategies and Mechanics – 12th Annual Bridgeport Class Action Litigation & Management Conference (April 2012)

- Developments In the Arbitration of Wage and Hour Disputes – Bridgeport 2010 Wage and Hour Conference (October 2010)

Bar Affiliations and Court Admissions:

- Bar of the State of California
- U.S. District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, and the District of Colorado
- Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

Professional Affiliations:

- Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
- Consumer Attorneys of California (Diversity Committee)
- American Bar Association (Labor and Employment Section)

Mr. George can be reached by email at: mgeorge@kaplanfox.com

ASSOCIATE

MARIO M. CHOI is a resident in the Oakland office and practices in the areas of securities, antitrust, and consumer protection litigation.

During law school, Mr. Choi interned for the Honorable Bruce M. Selya, U.S. Circuit Judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. After law school, Mr. Choi clerked for the Honorable Richard B. Lowe, III, in the Commercial Division of the New York Supreme Court, New York County. Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Choi was an associate with the law firm of Pryor Cashman LLP.

Mr. Choi is actively involved in the community, including serving as a Judge *Pro Tem* for the San Francisco Superior Court and on the boards of various non-profit organizations in the Bay Area. For his work, Mr. Choi was elected a Fellow of the American Bar Foundation.

Education:

- B.A., Boston University
- M.A., Columbia University
- J.D., Northeastern University

Bar Affiliations and Court Admissions:

- Bar of the State of New York

- Bar of the State of California
- U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Eighth and Ninth Circuits
- U.S. District Courts for the Northern, Southern and Central Districts of California and the Southern District of New York

Professional Affiliations:

- American Bar Association
- Asian American Bar Association – Bay Area
- Bar Association of San Francisco
- Federal Bar Association

Mr. Choi can be reached by email at: mchoi@kaplanfox.com